

Appropriations for FY1999: Legislative Branch

March 11, 1999

Congressional Research Service

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

98-212

Appropriations are one part of a complex federal budget process that includes budget resolutions, appropriations (regular, supplemental, and continuing) bills, rescissions, and budget reconciliation bills. The process begins with the President's budget request and is bounded by the rules of the House and Senate, the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (as amended), the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and current program authorizations.

This report is a guide to one of the 13 regular appropriations bills that Congress considers each year. It is designed to supplement the information provided by the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Legislative Branch Appropriations. It summarizes the current legislative status of the bill, its scope, major issues, funding levels, and related legislative activity. The report lists the key CRS staff relevant to the issues covered and related CRS products.

This report is updated as soon as possible after major legislative developments, especially following legislative action in the committees and on the floor of the House and Senate.

**NOTE: A Web version of this document with
active links is available to congressional staff at
[<http://www.loc.gov/crs/products/apppage.html>]**

Summary

On October 21, 1998, President Clinton signed H.R. 4112, the FY1999 Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, into P.L. 105-275. The act contains \$2.350 billion, a 2.7% increase over the FY1998 appropriation of \$2.288 billion. Later the same day, the President signed into law an omnibus appropriations bill that contains FY1999 emergency funding of \$223.7 million for legislative branch activities. These funds were made available to cover expenses associated with the Year-2000 conversion of “information technology systems” (\$16.9 million), to the Capitol Police Board for security of the Capitol complex and the Library of Congress (\$106.8 million), and to the Architect of the Capitol for expenses of “planning, engineering, design, and construction” of a Capitol Visitor Center (\$100 million).

On June 5, 1998, the Senate Committee on Appropriations reported S. 2137, its version of the FY1999 legislative branch budget (S.Rept. 105-204). On June 23, the House Committee on Appropriations reported its version, H.R. 4112 (H.Rept. 105-595). On June 25, the House passed H.R. 4112 (235-179), after agreeing to two amendments, and, on July 21, the Senate passed H.R. 4112, as amended (90-9). Conferees met and cleared the bill on September 18, and the House Appropriations Committee issued the conference report on September 22, 1998 (H.Rept. 105-734). The House adopted the report on September 24, by a vote of 356-65, and the Senate adopted it the following day, by voice vote.

Among the issues considered by both houses were the –

1. Number of additional staff and amount of funds necessary to ensure that Congress makes its computers Year-2000 compliant;
2. Funds for additional Capitol complex security, including construction of a Capitol Visitor Center;
3. Level of funding needed for capital improvements requested by the Architect of the Capitol;
4. Pay of the U.S. Capitol Police;
5. Appropriations needed for technology development, including online information, electronic document printing, and continued development of a legislative information system; and
6. Funding levels for the congressional support agencies, including the Government Printing Office, the Congressional Budget Office, the Library of Congress (including the Congressional Research Service), and the General Accounting Office.

The legislative budget is not particularly large, only 0.15% of the total federal budget.

Contents

Most Recent Developments.....	1
Introduction	1
Status	3
Developments This Year	3
Submission of the FY1999 Budget Estimates.....	3
Consideration in the Senate	4
Consideration in the House	5
Consideration in Conference Committee.....	6
FY1998 Supplemental Appropriations Bill.....	6
FY1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations	7
Major Issues Driving Discussions on the FY1999 Bill.....	7
Statement of Chairman Walsh.....	7
Statement of Chairman Bennett	8
Overall Funding Level Issues.....	8
Flat Budget.....	8
Modest Increase Proposals.....	8
Budget Decrease	9
Year-2000 Computer Reprogramming Issue	9
Technology Issues	10
House and Senate Legislative Information Systems.....	10
House System	11
Senate System.....	12
Anticipated Expenses of Internet Use.....	12
House and Senate Committee Funding	13
House Committee Funding	13
Senate Committee Funding.....	14
Joint Committee Issues	14
Abolishment of the Joint Committee on Printing	14
Security Issues.....	14
Capitol Complex Security Plan.....	14
Funding for the Capitol Police Board	15
Capitol Visitor Center	16
Architect of the Capitol Issues	16
Architect of the Capitol Budget	16
Support Agency Funding.....	18
Congressional Budget Office Budget	18
General Accounting Office Budget.....	18
Library of Congress Budget.....	19
Library of Congress, Except CRS.....	19
Government Printing Office Budget	20
Major Funding Trends	21
Guide to Determining Legislative Budget Trends	21
Current Legislative Budget Trends	22
For Additional Reading	31
CRS Reports.....	31
Selected World Wide Web Sites	31

Tables

Table 1. Status of Legislative Branch Appropriations, FY1999, H.R. 4112.....	3
Table 2. Legislative Branch Appropriations, FY1994 to FY1998.....	22
Table 3. Legislative Branch Appropriations, FY1999 In H.R. 4112 (Regular Annual Appropriations, P.L. 105-275) and H.R. 4328 (Emergency Supplemental Appropriations, P.L. 105-277).....	23
Table 4. Senate Items, FY1999 In H.R. 4112 (Regular Annual Appropriations, P.L. 105- 275) and H.R. 4328 (Emergency Supplemental Appropriations, P.L. 105-277)	25
Table 5. House of Representatives Items, FY1999 In H.R. 4112 (Regular Annual Appropriations, P.L. 105-275) and H.R. 4328 (Emergency Supplemental Appropriations, P.L. 105-277).....	26
Table 6. Legislative Branch Budget Authority Funded in Annual Appropriations Bills, FY1994-FY1998	28
Table 7. Legislative Branch Budget Authority Funded in Annual Appropriations Bills, FY1994-FY1998	29

Contacts

Author Information.....	32
-------------------------	----

Most Recent Developments

On October 21, 1998, President Clinton signed into law H.R. 4112, the FY1999 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill (P.L. 105-275). The act contains \$2.350 billion, a 2.7% increase over the FY1998 appropriation of \$2.288 billion.

Also on October 21, the President signed into law an omnibus consolidated and emergency supplemental appropriations bill that contains FY1999 emergency funding of \$223.7 million for legislative branch activities. These funds were made available to three legislative entities to cover expenses associated with the Year-2000 conversion of “information technology systems” (\$16.9 million), to the Capitol Police Board for enhanced security of the Capitol complex and the Library of Congress (\$106.8 million), and to the Architect of the Capitol for expenses of “planning, engineering, design, and construction” of a Capitol Visitor Center (\$100 million).

On June 25, 1998, the House passed H.R. 4112 by a vote of 235-179.¹ The bill provided \$1.8 billion, excluding funds for Senate internal activities and Senate activities funded in the Architect’s budget. H.R. 4112 was a 1.68% increase over the FY1998 comparable appropriation of \$1.77 billion.² Earlier, on June 23, the House Committee on Appropriations reported H.R. 4112 (H.Rept. 105-595).³

On July 21, the Senate passed its version of H.R. 4112, as amended, by a vote of 90-9. H.R. 4112, as passed by the Senate, provided \$1.6 billion for FY1999, excluding funds for House internal activities and House activities funded in the Architect of the Capitol’s budget. This figure represented a 3.5 % increase over the FY1998 comparable appropriation of \$1.5 billion.⁴ Earlier, on June 5, 1998, the Senate Committee on Appropriations reported S. 2137(S.Rept. 105-204).⁵

Conferees met and approved a final bill on October 18, and the House Appropriations Committee issued the conference report on October 22 (H.Rept. 105-734). The House adopted the report on September 24, by a vote of 356-65; the Senate adopted it the following day, by voice vote.

In April 1998, both houses passed, and President Clinton signed into law, an FY1998 supplemental appropriations bill (P.L. 105-174; H.R. 3579) that provides \$20 million for a perimeter security plan for the Capitol, Senate office buildings, and adjacent grounds, and \$7.5 million to begin repair of the Capitol dome.

Introduction

Since the late 1970s, the legislative branch appropriations bill has been divided into two titles. Title I, Congressional Operations, contains budget authorities for activities directly serving

¹ Rep. James Walsh and others, remarks in the House, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 144, June 25, 1998, p. H5315-H5329, H5331-H5352.

² This figure was derived by subtracting \$461 million for FY1998 Senate internal activities and \$52 million for Senate office buildings, under the Architect of the Capitol, from the total FY1998 budget authority of \$2.288 billion, which includes supplementals and a transfer.

³ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, 1999*, report to accompany H.R. 4112, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 105-595 (Washington: GPO, 1998), p. 52.

⁴ This figure was derived by subtracting \$708.7 million for FY1998 House internal activities and \$36.6 million for House office buildings, under the Architect of the Capitol, from the total FY1998 budget authority of \$2.288 billion, which includes supplementals and a transfer.

⁵ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations, 1999*, report to accompany S. 2137, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., S.Rept. 105-204 (Washington: GPO, 1998), p. 63.

Congress. Included in this title are the budgets of the House, the Senate, Joint Items (joint House and Senate activities), the Congressional Budget Office, the Architect of the Capitol (except Library of Congress buildings and grounds), the Congressional Research Service within the Library of Congress, and congressional printing and binding done by the Government Printing Office.

Title II, Related Agencies, contains budgets for activities not directly supporting Congress. Included in this title are the budgets of the Botanic Garden, Library of Congress (except the Congressional Research Service), the Library buildings and grounds within the Architect of the Capitol, the Government Printing Office (except congressional printing and binding costs), and the General Accounting Office. Periodically since FY1978, the legislative bill has also contained additional titles for such purposes as capital improvements and special one-time functions.

Title I budget authority was 70% of the total appropriation of \$2.288 billion in the FY1998 Legislative Branch Appropriation Act.⁶ Title II budget authority was 30% of the total appropriation. In addition, there are legislative budget authorities that are not included in the annual legislative branch appropriations act or supplemental appropriations acts. These include permanent budget authorities, trust fund budget authorities, and other budget authorities.⁷

Budget authorities appropriated permanently are available as the result of previously enacted legislation and do not require annual action.⁸ Tables providing budget authorities in recent bills appear at the end of this report.

Trust funds are monies held in accounts that are credited with collections from specific sources earmarked by law for a defined purpose. Trust funds do not appear in the annual legislative branch bill since they are not budget authority. They are included in the *U.S. Budget* either as budget receipts or offsetting collections.⁹

The *Budget* also shows some non-legislative entities within the legislative branch budget. These entities are funded in other appropriations bills. These non-legislative entities are placed within the legislative budget section by the Office of Management and Budget for bookkeeping purposes.¹⁰

⁶ The figure includes \$2.249 billion appropriated in the FY1998 Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, a \$27.8 million FY1998 supplemental appropriation, and an \$11 million transfer to the Government Printing Office (GPO) from the GPO revolving fund.

⁷ Other budget authorities are those of some non-legislative entities within the legislative branch budget that are actually funded in other appropriations bills.

⁸ Permanent budget authorities are cited by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in the annual *U.S. Budget*. In FY1998, the following legislative activities were funded by permanent budget authorities: House and Senate Member pay; House and Senate use of foreign currencies; international conferences and contingencies; and Library of Congress payments to copyright owners. According to the House Committee on Appropriations (H.Rept. 105-595), the FY1998 permanent budget authority for the above activities was \$315 million.

⁹ FY1998 total legislative branch trust fund authority is \$29 million. This figure includes Library of Congress gift and trust fund accounts (\$23 million); Library of Congress cooperative acquisitions revolving fund (\$3 million); U.S. Capitol Preservation Commission trust funds (\$1 million); Architect of the Capitol gifts and donations (\$1 million); and the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development trust funds (\$1 million). Source for trust fund authorities is the House Committee on Appropriations (H.Rept. 105-595).

¹⁰ The FY1999 *U.S. Budget* includes non-legislative entities under two headings: (1) "U.S. Tax Court" and (2) "Other Legislative Branch Agencies - Legislative Branch Boards and Commissions." Included in the latter category are the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission; the Physician Payment Review Commission; the Gambling Impact Study Commission; the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicine; the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission; the Commission on the Advancement of Federal Law Enforcement; and a subcategory for "Other Legislative Branch Boards and Commissions." The *U.S. Budget* does not give information on the budget authorities of

Status

Table I. Status of Legislative Branch Appropriations, FY1999, H.R. 4112

Subcommittee Markup		House Report	House Passage	Senate Report	Senate Passage	Conference Report	Conference Report Approval		Public Law
House	Senate						House	Senate	
6/10/98	6/4/98 ^a	H.Rept. 105-595 6/23/98	6/25/98 (235-179)	S.Rept. 105-204 6/5/98	7/21/98 (90-9)	H.Rept. 105-734 9/22/98	9/24/98 (356-65)	9/25/98 (voice vote)	P.L. 105-275 10/21/98

a. The Senate version was marked up by the full Committee on Appropriations.

Developments This Year

Submission of the FY1999 Budget Estimates

In February 1998, President Clinton submitted his FY1999 budget of \$2.263 billion for legislative activities funded in the legislative branch appropriations bill. This figure was subsequently amended by individual legislative branch agencies to \$2.467 billion.¹¹ As amended, the request represented an increase of \$218 million, or 9.7%, over the FY1998 appropriation of \$2.249 billion,¹² before the FY1998 supplemental and a Government Printing Office transfer. The proposed FY1999 budget provided for an additional 122 FTE staff positions¹³ in the legislative branch (excluding the Senate). The number of FTEs would have been increased by 0.5%, from 23,045 to 23,166.¹⁴

entities in the subcategory "Other Legislative Branch Boards and Commissions." For a more accurate picture of the legislative budget, the budget authorities for non-legislative entities should be subtracted from the total legislative budget authority provided in the *U.S. Budget*. The FY1999 *U.S. Budget* shows an FY1999 total legislative budget authority request of \$2.620 billion, including permanent budget authority, trust funds, and non-legislative entities. After removing non-legislative entities, the total is \$2.617 billion, including permanent budget authority and trust funds. Additionally excluding permanent budget authority and trust funds, the total is \$2.260 billion. Since the FY1999 request was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the request was revised by legislative branch agencies to \$2.467 billion.

¹¹ Source is the FY1999 *U.S. Budget* and the House Committee on Appropriations for budget estimates, and amendments, for the legislative branch. The source for all except Senate activities is the House Committee on Appropriations. The source for Senate operations and activities is the FY1999 *U.S. Budget*. Senate activities include those for operations of the Senate (\$477 million) and Senate activities under the Architect of the Capitol (\$56 million). This figure does not include permanent appropriations or trust funds. In December of each year, legislative agencies submit their budget requests for the upcoming fiscal year to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The agencies' requests are prepared during the previous months. Subsequently, OMB incorporates the agencies' requests without change into the President's annual budget submitted to Congress early the following year. The legislative agencies may revise their budget requests at any time.

¹² The FY1999 request of \$2.467 billion includes \$1.934 billion for the legislative branch, excluding the Senate, plus \$477 million for Senate operations, and \$56 million for Senate activities under the Architect of the Capitol.

¹³ FTEs (full-time equivalents) are an estimate of the total number of work years required by an agency over the course of a fiscal year. They are calculated by totaling the total number of hours worked by all employees and then dividing that total by 2,080, the number of hours in a work year. One FTE equals 2,080 hours. One FTE is an employee working 40 hours per week for 52 weeks in the year.

¹⁴ Source is the House Committee on Appropriations.

Consideration in the Senate

The Senate considered H.R. 4112 on July 17, 20, and July 21, when it was passed, as amended. As passed, the bill contained \$1.6 billion, excluding funds for House internal activities and House activities funded in the Architect of the Capitol's (AOCs) budget. This figure represented a 3.5% increase over the FY1998 comparable appropriation of \$1.5 billion.¹⁵ Among other provisions, the Senate bill:

- Appropriated 4.4% less than the FY1999 budget estimate, a decrease of \$72.4 million. The FY1999 estimate was \$1.657 billion; the FY1999 Senate bill was \$1.59 billion;
- Appropriated a 3.5% increase, or \$53.7 million, over the FY1998 budget. The FY1998 level is \$1.5 billion; the FY1999 version was \$1.59 billion;
- Contained additional funds, mostly for employee cost-of-living pay adjustments and associated costs of those adjustments (3.1% of the total 3.4% increase);¹⁶ and,
- Provided for a 1.8% increase in the Senate's housekeeping budget, from \$461.1 million in FY1998 to \$469.4 million in FY1999.

Five amendments were adopted by the Senate on July 20. These amendments contained language:

- (1) Amending the House bill to include appropriations for Senate internal operations and Senate activities funded under the Architect of the Capitol in H.R. 4112;
- (2) Increasing the appropriation for general expenses of the Capitol Police by \$220,000 (from \$6,077,000 to \$6,297,000);
- (3) Creating a separate appropriations subaccount for the Committee on Appropriations, under the account, "Salaries, Officers, and Employees," deleting appropriations for the committee previously contained in the account, "Contingent Expenses of the Senate," subaccount, "Inquiries and Investigations;"
- (4) Amending Title IV of the Senate bill establishing a Trade Deficit Review Commission; and,
- (5) Requiring certain legislative branch officials to submit to Congress lists of activities to be performed under their jurisdictions during FY2000, including those activities "not inherently governmental functions."¹⁷

Before passage on July 21, the Senate agreed, by a vote of 83-16, to invoke cloture, closing further debate on H.R. 4112, as amended. Subsequently, an amendment to make reports of the

¹⁵ This figure was derived by subtracting \$708.7 million for FY1998 House internal activities and \$36.6 million for House office buildings, under the Architect of the Capitol, from the total FY1998 budget authority of \$2.277 billion. The Senate report on the FY1999 bill uses an FY1998 budget authority of \$2.277 billion. The House report uses \$2.288 which includes an \$11 million transfer to the Government Printing Office (GPO) from the GPO revolving fund.

¹⁶ Statement of Chairman Bennett of the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations during markup by the full Senate Committee on Appropriations of the FY1999 Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, June 4, 1998.

¹⁷ These officials are the Architect of the Capitol, Secretary of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, public printer, and director and executive director of the Botanic Garden. The term "inherently governmental functions" is defined as "functions so intimately related to the public interest as to require performance by Federal Government employees." See Sen. Ted Stevens, remarks in the Senate, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 144, July 20, 1998, p. S8556.

Congressional Research Service available to the public on the Internet was ruled out of order as being non-germane when cloture was invoked.

Earlier, on June 4, the Senate Committee on Appropriations marked up and ordered its version reported. On June 5, the committee reported S. 2137.¹⁸

Consideration in the House

On June 25, the House passed H.R. 4112, by a vote of 235-179.¹⁹ H.R. 4112 provided \$1.8 billion, excluding funds for Senate internal activities and Senate activities funded in the AOC's budget.

Among other provisions, the House bill:

- Provided \$1.8 billion, which is 1.68% over the FY1998 comparable appropriation of \$1.77 billion.²⁰ The majority of the increase is for mandatory cost-of-living pay adjustments and related costs;
- Provided an actual decrease of 0.52% from the FY1998 funding level, when allowing for inflation (based on a projected Consumer Price Index increase of 2.2%);
- Eliminated 438 FTE positions from the legislative branch;
- Made possible staff cuts, in addition to the 438 FTE reduction, by authorizing staff buy-outs by the Architect of the Capitol and the Government Printing Office;
- Was a 6.7% decrease from the FY1999 budget request; and,
- Was \$555.3 million below the 302(b) allocation established by the House Committee on Appropriations.

Two amendments were agreed to on the House floor:

- Providing that \$100,000 of the amount appropriated for the item, House Office Buildings, within the heading, "Architect of the Capitol," subheading, "Capitol Buildings and Grounds," be made available for House waste recycling programs (voice vote); and
- Mandating the establishment of an energy conservation plan by the Architect of the Capitol for all facilities administered by Congress (voice vote).

Earlier, on June 18, the House Committee on Appropriations marked up and ordered its version reported, subsequent to markup by the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations on June 10. The full committee reported H.R. 4112 on June 23.²¹

¹⁸ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations, 1999*, report to accompany S. 2137, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., S.Rept. 105-204 (Washington: GPO, 1998), p. 63.

¹⁹ Representative James Walsh and others, remarks in the House, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 144, June 25, 1998, pp. H5315-H5329, H5331-H5352.

²⁰ This figure was derived by subtracting \$461 million for FY1998 Senate internal activities and \$52 million for Senate office buildings, under the Architect of the Capitol, from the total FY1998 budget authority of \$2.288 billion, including supplementals and a transfer.

²¹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, 1999*, report to accompany H.R. 4112, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 105-595 (Washington: GPO, 1998), p. 52.

Three amendments were adopted in the full committee markup of June 18, none of which required new funds: They were (1) report language restating that the Congressional Budget Office be impartial and independent from political pressure (Representative David Obey); (2) language directing that Members be authorized to make monthly payments to each employee to subsidize his/her transportation (Representative Steny Hoyer);²² and (3) report language that encourages artwork in the Capitol to more fully represent women's contributions to society (Representative Marcy Kaptur).²³

Consideration in Conference Committee

On September 18, 1998, conferees met and agreed to \$2.350 billion, a 2.7% increase over FY1998's \$2.288 billion. Allowing for inflation, the increase is +0.5%.

Among the agreements made in conference were:

- An increase in funding of 12.2% for the U.S. Capitol Police, from \$74.1 million in FY1998 to \$83.1 million in FY1999. The FY1999 figure includes funds for 1,251 FTEs and funds of \$2.4 million for pay parity, including night differentials, and \$1.7 million for an adjustment to the longevity schedule, subject to approval by the Committee on House Oversight and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration;
- Additional appropriations for the General Accounting Office (GAO) program changes including funds for 50 FTEs and language by conferees that they expected at least one-third of the program changes funding increase to be used "to support information technology (IT) work, particularly in support of issues related to the Year 2000 computing crisis."²⁴ Conferees directed that those funds in excess of those required for the additional FTEs be allocated to program contract support and directed the comptroller general to account for the use of these additional funds, including the number of FTEs and the amount of these additional funds used to acquire contract services; and,
- Deletion of a provision in the Senate bill containing funds for a Trade Deficit Review Commission.

FY1998 Supplemental Appropriations Bill

On April 30, 1998, both houses agreed to the conference report on H.R. 3579, an FY1998 supplemental appropriation bill, which provides \$20 million for a perimeter security plan for the Capitol building, Senate office buildings, and adjacent grounds, and \$7.5 million to begin repairs on the Capitol dome. H.R. 3579 was signed into law (P.L. 105-174) on May 1, 1998. The act also provides \$270,300 for gratuities to the widows and heirs of two deceased House Members. With the supplemental appropriations, the total appropriation for FY1998 legislative branch activities is \$2.288 billion.²⁵

²² The provision was later struck from H.R. 4112.

²³ The amendment's sponsor noted that a study by the Architect of the Capitol showed that, of 451 individual portraits, 14, or 3%, depict women.

²⁴ U.S. Congress, Conference Committees, 1998, *Making Appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1999, and For Other Purposes*, conference report to accompany H.R. 4112, H.Rept. 105-734, 105th Cong., 2nd sess. (Washington: GPO, 1998), p. 43.

²⁵ In addition to supplementals, this figure includes an \$11 million transfer to the Government Printing Office from its revolving fund.

FY1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations

On October 21, the President signed into law an omnibus consolidated and emergency supplemental appropriations bill with \$223.7 million for legislative branch activities (P.L. 105-277). The act contained \$16.9 million for expenses of Year-2000 conversion of “information technology systems” with \$5.5 million for the Senate, \$6.4 million for the House, and \$5 million for the General Accounting Office to use for other legislative entities, except the Senate and House. In addition, the act contained \$106.8 million for security enhancement of the Capitol complex and the Library of Congress by the Capitol Police Board, and \$100 million for expenses of “planning, engineering, design, and construction” of a Capitol Visitor Center.

Major Issues Driving Discussions on the FY1999 Bill

Among the main issues that drove consideration of the FY1998 supplemental and the FY1999 legislative branch appropriations bill were the following.

- What additional staff and funds might be necessary to ensure that Congress makes its computers Year-2000 compliant?
- Should U.S. Capitol Police pay be comparable to other public sector police?
- How much should funding be increased for security enhancement for the Capitol, other congressional buildings, and adjacent grounds?
- How much should be appropriated for the Architect of the Capitol’s request to undertake various improvements to the Capitol?
- What are the appropriations needs for technology development, including online information, electronic document printing, and continued development of a legislative information system?
- What should be the funding levels for the congressional support agencies, including the Government Printing Office, the Congressional Budget Office, the Library of Congress (including the Congressional Research Service), and the General Accounting Office?

The effort in recent years to trim the legislative budget also continued during consideration of the FY1999 budget in the House and Senate Subcommittees on Legislative Branch Appropriations.

Statement of Chairman Walsh

During opening remarks at hearings on the FY1999 budget, Chairman James Walsh of the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations indicated a tight budget, stating that he “fully expects reductions along the way” from the pending budget requests.²⁶ Chairman Walsh continued by saying that he would give “careful scrutiny” to agency funding requests and expects the subcommittee to be “responsible” and “ensure that the legislative branch contributes its fair share to balancing the budget.”²⁷

²⁶ Remarks of Chairman James Walsh before the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, Jan. 29, 1998.

²⁷ Ibid.

Statement of Chairman Bennett

During the first day of hearings by the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations on the FY1999 budget, Chairman Robert Bennett indicated that “while most agencies acted responsibly in submitting their FY1999 requests, cuts in the requests were likely.”²⁸ He emphasized that one of the top priorities was to ensure that Congress and its support agencies reprogram their computers, or purchase new ones, to meet the Year-2000 compliance deadline.²⁹ Chairman Bennett listed Capitol Hill security among other priorities of the Senate subcommittee.

Overall Funding Level Issues

Each spring, as members of the House and Senate Subcommittees on Legislative Branch Appropriations consider funding requests from legislative agencies, they are faced with three primary options: to maintain a flat budget; to provide a modest increase; or to approve a budget decrease. Statements by subcommittee members during February 1998 indicated support for a possible modest increase in the FY1999 budget.³⁰ The bills initially approved by the House and Senate contained modest increases over the FY1998 appropriations level. The Senate bill provided for a 3.4% increase, but when accounting for the projected inflation for 1998, the increase was 1.2%. The House bill, although providing a 1.68% increase, was actually a decrease of 0.52% when accounting for inflation.

The conference version of the FY1999 bill provides for a 2.7% increase over FY1998, from \$2.288 billion to \$2.359 billion. Allowing for inflation, the increase is +0.5%.

The legislative branch budget is not particularly large. It is 0.15% of the total federal budget.

Flat Budget

A “flat” budget typically provides new funds for mandatory cost increases, but denies additional funding requests.³¹ A flat budget can be difficult to achieve due to a number of factors, such as ongoing and emergency maintenance and repair needs and the continuing effort to keep legislative branch operations current with recent technology developments.

Modest Increase Proposals

The versions of the FY1999 Legislative Branch Appropriations passed by the House and Senate allowed for modest increases, the option Congress also chose in FY1998. The conference version of the FY1999 bill provides for a 2.7% increase over FY1998, from \$2.288 billion to \$2.350 billion. The increase is smaller when allowing for inflation, or +0.5%.

Conferees on the FY1998 legislative funding bill approved a 2.1% increase in current dollars, from \$2.203 billion in FY1997 to \$2.249 billion in FY1998. Allowing for inflation, the FY1998 conference figures were actually a 0.1% decrease, from \$2.251 billion in FY1997 to \$2.249 billion in FY1998. Conferees on the FY1998 bill compromised with the Senate version of the

²⁸ Remarks of Chairman Robert Bennett during the first day of hearings by the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, Feb. 26, 1998.

²⁹ See a discussion of the Year-2000 compliance problem below.

³⁰ The statements were made during hearings on the FY1999 legislative branch budget request.

³¹ Mandatory costs are those mandated by statute. They include annual cost-of-living pay adjustments and increases in the government’s contribution to the federal employee retirement program.

FY1998 bill that provided for a 3.5% increase, and the House version that provided for a 0.6% reduction, both percentages based on current dollars.

Budget Decrease

Although the House passed an FY1999 legislative branch appropriations bill that contained a 1.68% increase over FY1998, the bill was actually a reduction of 0.52% when accounting for inflation. As passed, the House bill contained an increase from \$1.775 billion in FY1998 to \$1.805 billion in FY1999.³² Allowing for inflation, the bill contained a decrease from \$1.814 billion in FY1998 to \$1.805 billion in FY1999. Even though the FY1999 conference version contains an increase, from \$2.288 billion to \$2.350 billion, the increase is small, +0.5%, when accounting for inflation.

Congress has approved other budget decreases in recent years. In the FY1996 bill, Congress approved a budget decrease of 8.2%, from an FY1995 budget of \$2.378 billion to an FY1996 budget of \$2.184 billion. When accounting for inflation, the decrease was 10.8%, from \$2.559 billion in FY1995 to \$2.283 billion in FY1996. Although the FY1997 and FY1998 bills contained increases, when adjusted for inflation, both bills contained actual decreases in the legislative budget. The FY1997 bill contained a 0.87% increase, from \$2.184 billion in FY1996 to \$2.203 billion in FY1997. When adjusted for inflation, the FY1997 bill was a 1.4% decrease, from \$2.283 in FY1996 to \$2.251 in FY1997. The FY1998 budget contained a 2.1% increase over the FY1997 budget, from \$2.203 billion in FY1997 to \$2.249 in FY1998, prior to an FY1998 subsequent supplemental and transfer. Allowing for inflation, the change was a decrease of 0.1%, from \$2.251 in FY1997 to \$2.249 in FY1998.

Year-2000 Computer Reprogramming Issue

Congress continued to work toward ensuring that the legislative branch and other federal agencies achieve the computer reprogramming and other changes necessary by the Year 2000. This is necessary because most computers use a two-digit year system for purposes of dating. The system assumes “19” to be the first two digits of any year. If not reprogrammed, computers using the two-digit system would interpret the year 2000 – 00 – as 1900. The result would be data errors and possibly computer shutdowns.

Conferees included additional funding for GAO program changes including appropriations for 50 FTEs and inserted language that they expected at least one-third of the program funding increase to be used “to support information technology (IT) work, particularly in support of issues related to the Year 2000 computing crisis.”³³ Conferees directed that those funds in excess of those required for the additional FTEs be allocated to program contract support and directed the comptroller general to account on the use of these additional funds, including the number of FTEs and the amount of the increase used to acquire contract services.

In addition, Congress made available an emergency supplemental of \$16.9 million to the legislative branch for Year-2000 compliance efforts in the FY1999 Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 105-277). The act makes available the following amounts: \$5.5 million for the Senate, under Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate; \$6.4 million for the House of Representatives, under Salaries and Expenses, Salaries, Officers, and Employees; and \$5 million for GAO, under

³² Both the FY1998 and FY1999 figures exclude funding for Senate internal activities and Senate activities funded for Senate office buildings within the budget of the Architect of the Capitol.

³³ Conference report, FY1999, p. 43.

Information Technology Systems and Related Expenses. Funds transferred to GAO are to be available for transfer from GAO to “all entities of the legislative branch other than the ‘Senate’ and ‘House of Representatives’ covered by the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1998.” Transfers by GAO are subject to approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

According to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), it will cost the federal government, including Congress, an estimated \$2.3 billion to make the adjustments necessary. This figure is considered by Representative Steve Horn, chair of the House subcommittee with oversight responsibility for the Year-2000 conversion, to be underestimated. Mr. Horn believes the figure does not include all expected labor costs for computer programmers.³⁴

Some computer programs in the legislative branch have already encountered problems in projecting payroll data beyond 1999. The House Information Resources Office and the House Inspector General estimate the cost of Year-2000 compliance in the House of Representatives alone to be somewhere between \$1.2 million and \$3.6 million.

During his opening remarks at the Senate hearings on the FY1999 legislative budget, Chairman Robert Bennett stated that dealing with the Year-2000 issue was of major importance to the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations.³⁵ He noted that ramifications of the problem and possible solutions had already been discussed at five separate hearings held by the Subcommittee on Financial Services and Technology, which he also chairs. He stated that the legislative branch needs to be as aggressive with its own compliance program as it is with these programs in the executive branch.

Chairman Bennett’s concern is shared by others in the Senate. In April 1998, the Senate majority and minority leaders announced the creation of a special congressional committee to oversee Year-2000 conversion efforts in the executive and judicial branches. The Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem, chaired by Senator Bennett, will hold hearings on the progress of federal agencies in achieving Year-2000 compliance. The select committee’s budget is \$575,000 through February 29, 2000. Funds for the committee are included in the FY1999 bill under the Senate account, “Contingent Fund of the Senate,” subaccount, “Inquiries and Investigations.”

In late June, the Speaker of the House also announced the establishment of a House task force on the Year-2000 problem as a counterpart to the Senate special committee. The House task force consists of members of the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and the Subcommittee on Technology of the Committee on Science.

Technology Issues

House and Senate Legislative Information Systems

Both houses continued to take steps to reduce duplication of effort in tracking legislation, to upgrade legislative tracking systems, and to ensure that Congress achieves the needed reprogramming of its computers by the Year 2000.³⁶ To accomplish this, both the House and

³⁴ Source is statement of Chairman Stephen Horn during a hearing by the House Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology on the “Year 2000 Problem,” Feb. 25, 1997.

³⁵ Remarks made by Chairman Robert Bennett during the first day of hearings by the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, Feb. 26, 1998.

³⁶ See discussion on the need to reprogram computers by the year 2000 above.

Senate are continuing to develop information systems that create and manage legislative data files.

The House legislative information system is administered by the House Clerk. The Senate system is administered by the Secretary of the Senate. The Clerk and the Secretary continue to exchange information on development of their own systems. They also report, respectively, to the House Oversight Committee and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration on their recommendations regarding the electronic transfer of legislative data between the two houses and among all legislative entities.

In support of development of the House and Senate legislative information systems, both houses directed the Congressional Research Service (CRS) to develop a data retrieval system with the technical support of the Library of Congress (LOC) and in collaboration with other legislative branch agencies, such as the Government Printing Office (GPO).³⁷ The House and Senate legislative information systems are expected to reduce duplication through the consolidation of existing legislative retrieval systems.

House System

In FY1996, the Committee on House Oversight directed the Clerk to study methods for increasing the capacity of the House to manage its documents electronically. The committee further directed that subsequent proposals of the Clerk relating to printing be coordinated with the GPO and all House entities requiring printing and storage of documents.

The House requested funding for FY1999 to continue its development of a document management system (DMS) to provide a method for creating, tracking, editing, sharing, printing, and transmitting documents. The Clerk estimates that the DMS will be completed within the next three years.³⁸ The primary purpose of the system, according to the Clerk, is to allow the House to move from its dependency on the GPO for preparing, printing, and distributing House documents.³⁹

The DMS is designed to automate document preparation (using a PC-based system for print-on-demand and for electronic transmission to GPO). Although development of the DMS is costly, the Clerk anticipates savings to the House of approximately \$1 million annually in administrative and printing costs.⁴⁰

The House report on the FY1998 legislative branch appropriations bill contained language that directed the Congressional Research Service and the Library of Congress to:

³⁷ In the FY1997 Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, the Senate directed CRS and the Library to develop a retrieval system. The language was contained in an amendment that was deleted from the legislation, but maintained in the conference report. Subsequent to passage of the FY1997 bill, the chairman of the House Oversight Committee directed CRS and the Library to ensure that the retrieval system being developed for the Senate also meets the requirements of the House. The chairman's directive was contained in a letter to the CRS director dated Oct. 9, 1996.

³⁸ Testimony of Robin Carle, Clerk of the House, before the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, Jan. 29, 1998.

³⁹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1998*, hearings, part 1, 105th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 1997 (Washington: GPO, 1997), p. 163.

⁴⁰ Comments of the Clerk of the House before the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, Feb. 4, 1997. See also the Clerk's testimony on the DMS in U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1998*, hearings, part 2, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., Feb. 1997 (Washington: GPO, 1997), p. 43.

“....devote sufficient resources to accomplish the following during FY1998:

- (1) provide comparable functionality so that legacy retrieval systems can be retired by 12/31/98;
- (2) improve productivity of congressional staff by making significant progress in implementing previously identified high-priority functionality; and
- (3) improve the accuracy, usability, and timeliness of legislative information retrieval.”⁴¹

Senate System

The FY1997 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act directed the Secretary of the Senate to develop a legislative information system for the Senate.⁴² The act directed that the Secretary oversee the system’s development and implementation, subject to approval of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. Like the House, the Senate system provides a means for creating, tracking, editing, sharing, and transmitting documents.

The FY1997 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act funded the Senate system by authorizing the Secretary to use unspent FY1995 monies previously appropriated for the Office of the Secretary of the Senate; it remains available until September 30, 1998. The Secretary was also authorized to transfer to the development of the legislative information system, as he determined to be necessary, funds already appropriated to the Secretary’s office for the purpose of development of the Senate financial management system.

Access to additional funding was provided in the FY1997 supplemental appropriations bill signed into law (P.L. 105-18; H.R. 1871) June 12, 1997. The act authorized the transfer of \$5 million from other Senate accounts to the account, “Contingent Expenses of the Senate,” under the subaccount, “Secretary of the Senate.”⁴³ The money was made available through September 30, 2000. The transfer is subject to approval of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Funds for FY1999 are pending in the Senate-passed FY1999 appropriations bill that contains funds for the Office of the Secretary of the Senate.

The FY1999 Senate report on S. 2137 also contains language that directs the Congressional Research Service and the Library “to continue their development of the legislative retrieval system for the Senate and provide an annual report outlining the strategic objective of this initiative.”⁴⁴

Anticipated Expenses of Internet Use

The costs of technology advancement, including increased use of the Internet, in the House and Senate are factors in the pending budgets. Throughout the United States, Internet usage more than doubled between July 1995 and March 1997.⁴⁵ It is anticipated that Congress could face

⁴¹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, 1998*, report to accompany H.R. 2209, 105th Cong., 1st sess., H.Rept. 105-196 (Washington: GPO, 1997), p. 8.

⁴² P.L. 104-197, 110 Stat. 2398, Sept. 16, 1996, sec. 8, *FY1996 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act*.

⁴³ For language in H.R. 1871 that is relevant to the legislative branch, see Representative Robert Livingston, remarks in the House, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, June 12, 1997, p. H3766. This provision was originally included in the earlier version of the FY1997 supplemental bill, H.R. 1469, which was vetoed by the President on June 9, 1997.

⁴⁴ Senate report, FY1999, p. 41.

⁴⁵ Source is telephone conversation with spokesperson for the Nielson Media Research Group.

significant expenses in meeting the demands of increased constituent communications via the Internet. House Internet usage increased by 800% in 1995 and 1996.⁴⁶

Some expect, however, that some technology expenses will be offset by savings. For example, during the 105th Congress, savings to the House are estimated to be almost \$750,000, primarily for operating expenses and maintenance fees, accomplished by (1) replacement of an IBM mainframe by an IBM CMOS Enterprise Service (estimated \$505,000 savings), and (2) installation of a “higher-reliability, direct-access storage system” (estimated \$246,500 savings).⁴⁷

House and Senate Committee Funding

House Committee Funding

H.R. 4112 provides \$109.1 million for House committee funding in FY1999. Committee funds were authorized by the House early in 1997, when the House adopted a resolution authorizing committee funds essentially for the 105th Congress (calendar years 1997 and 1998). Part of these funds were provided in the FY1998 legislative branch appropriations act.⁴⁸ The FY1998 act provided \$104.5 million for committee funding.

A funding resolution was reported by the Committee on House Oversight on March 17, 1997 (H.Res. 91). The resolution authorized \$178.3 million for House committees (except for the Appropriations Committee). On March 20, the rule for consideration of the resolution was defeated on the floor.

On March 21, 1997, the House agreed to an interim funding authorization through May 2, 1997 (H.Res. 91). The interim measure was needed because the existing funding authorization was set to expire on March 31, 1997. With one exception, this interim resolution continued funding for committees at the same level as that for committees in January through March 1997 (9% per month of the previous session’s total funding). The measure authorized funds for the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight for the entire 105th Congress, and provided the committee a budget of \$20 million.

A new committee funding resolution was ordered reported by the Committee on House Oversight on April 28, 1997 (H.Res. 129). The resolution authorized \$177.8 million for committees, except Government Reform and Oversight and Appropriations, for the 105th Congress. This figure was \$550,740 less than the original funding resolution the House voted against considering on March 20. On May 1, 1997, the House agreed to the new resolution by a vote of 262-157.

The House Committee on Appropriations was authorized and appropriated \$18.3 million for FY1998. The committee is authorized and appropriated \$19.4 million in H.R. 4112, the FY1999 legislative branch appropriations bill.

⁴⁶ Testimony of Representative Vernon Ehlers on the “CyberCongress initiative” before the House Committee on Oversight, Feb. 11, 1997. Representative Ehlers is chairman of the House Computer and Information Working Group of the House Oversight Committee.

⁴⁷ Letter to the editor from Representative Vernon Ehlers, chairman of the House Computer and Information Working Group of the House Oversight Committee, in *Roll Call*, Feb. 17, 1997, p. 4.

⁴⁸ Other appropriations will come from the FY1997 and FY1999 legislative branch appropriations acts. Committee funds are authorized essentially on a two-year calendar basis, yet funded on an annual, fiscal year basis (Oct. 1 - Sept. 30).

Senate Committee Funding

H.R. 4112 provides \$66.8 million for Senate committee operations in FY1999. Senate committee funds were authorized early in 1997 by the Senate (S.Res. 54). The Senate funding resolution, adopted on February 13, 1997, provided for 100% funding of the recurring 1996 level, plus cost-of-living adjustments for specific purposes and time periods.⁴⁹

The resolution was amended on March 11 to provide an additional \$4.35 million for the Committee on Governmental Affairs.⁵⁰ Funds were provided for a special investigation of illegal or improper actions related to the 1996 elections. A point of debate was whether to include both illegal and improper activities as targets of the committee's investigation. Ultimately, both were included.

Joint Committee Issues

Abolishment of the Joint Committee on Printing

Conferees agreed to \$352,000 for the Joint Committee on Printing until December 31, 1998, when it is anticipated the joint committee will be terminated. Matters under its jurisdiction are to be transferred to the Committee on House Oversight, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and the public printer. This figure represents \$202,000, which was contained in both the House and Senate versions, plus \$150,000 to be available to the Committee on House Oversight. The \$150,000 appropriation is available only if the legislative and oversight responsibilities of the joint committee are transferred by law to the Committee on House Oversight and other committees and congressional entities.⁵¹ In such case, the \$150,000 is to be transferred to the Committee on House Oversight, effective January 1, 1999.

The Senate provided \$150,000 in additional funds to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration for the committee's costs in assuming responsibilities of the joint committee.⁵² The additional funding is included in FY1999 funding of \$66.8 million for Senate committee expenses in the Senate subaccount, "Inquiries and Investigations," within the account, "Contingent Expenses of the Senate."

Security Issues

Capitol Complex Security Plan

In his FY1999 budget proposal submitted to Congress, the Architect of the Capitol requested \$20 million for a perimeter security plan for the Capitol, Senate office buildings, and adjacent grounds. Congress then approved the funds as part of an FY1998 supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 3579). The appropriation was included by the Senate in its version of H.R. 3579.⁵³ On April

⁴⁹ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, *Authorizing Biennial Expenditures by Committees of the Senate*, report to accompany S.Res. 54, 105th Cong., 1st sess., S.Rept. 105-9 (Washington: GPO, 1971), p. 1.

⁵⁰ Senator Trent Lott, remarks in the Senate, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, March 11, 1997, p. S2096.

⁵¹ House report, FY1999, p. 14.

⁵² These funds are in addition to the amount authorized the committee (\$1,375,472) in S.Res. 54, agreed to Feb. 13, 1997, which was increased to \$1,407,254 in P.L. 105-55, Oct. 7, 1997.

⁵³ Similar language providing \$20 million for a perimeter security plan was reported to the House in another FY1998 supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 3580. The report language of H.R. 3580 states that the expenditure of funds are subject to approval by the appropriate House and Senate authorities, including the House and Senate Appropriations

30, both houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, and it was signed into law (P.L. 105-174) May 1, 1998. The relevant provision of the law reads:

For necessary expenses for the design, installation and maintenance of the Capitol Square Perimeter Security Plan, \$20,000,000 (of which not to exceed \$4,000,000 shall be transferred upon request of the Capitol Police Board to the Capitol Police Board, "Capitol Police," "General Expenses," for physical security measures associated with the Capitol Square perimeter security plan) to remain available until expended, subject to the review and approval by the appropriate House and Senate authorities.⁵⁴

The appropriation for the perimeter security plan was based on recommendations that a task force on perimeter security prepared for the U.S. Capitol Police Board. Of the \$20 million, \$4 million would go to the Capitol Police Board, upon the Board's request, for expenses of design and installation of security systems that are part of the perimeter plan.

The report of the Senate Appropriations Committee on S. 1768 states that funds provided for perimeter security of *Senate office buildings* are subject to review and approval of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.⁵⁵ It further states that funds provided for perimeter security of the "Capitol Square" are subject to review and approval of the House Committee on Appropriations, Committee on House Oversight, Speaker of the House, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and Senate Committee on Appropriations.

A perimeter security plan for the Capitol Building and its grounds was approved by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration October 30, 1997, subsequent to its presentation by the Architect of the Capitol at a committee hearing a month earlier. The same day, the Rules Committee also approved a plan that authorized the Architect of the Capitol to move forward immediately in developing perimeter security for the area immediately adjacent to the three Senate office buildings. The House Oversight Committee would approve any plan for the House office buildings, while the House Appropriations Committee would make the final determination of funds needed.

Funding for the Capitol Police Board

Conferees agreed to a 12.2% funding increase for the U.S. Capitol Police, from \$74.1 million in FY1998 to \$83.1 million in FY1999. The conference figure contained \$2.4 million for pay parity, including night differentials, and \$1.7 million for an adjustment to the longevity schedule, pending approval by the Committee on House Oversight and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. The FY1999 emergency supplemental (P.L. 105-277) contained an additional \$106.8 million for security enhancements.

The FY1999 budget estimate for the Capitol Police Board was \$84.5 million, \$76.1 million for Capitol Police salaries and benefits, and \$8.4 million for general expenses. The House version

Committees, Speaker of the House, Committee on House Oversight, and Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Making Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions for the Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1998*, report to accompany H.R. 3580, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 105-470 (Washington: GPO, 1998), pp. 11-12.

⁵⁴ P.L. 105-174, May 1, 1998. See also U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Making Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions for the Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1998*, report to accompany H.R. 3580, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 105-470 (Washington: GPO, 1998), pp. 11-12, and U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Recovery from Natural Disasters, and for Overseas Peacekeeping Efforts, for the Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1998*, report to accompany S. 1768, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., S.Rept. 105-168 (Washington: GPO, 1998), p. 22.

⁵⁵ Ibid., S.Rept. 105-168.

contained \$76.4 million for the Board, or 3.1% more than FY1998's budget of \$74.1 million. The Senate version contained \$80.6 million, an 8.8% increase over FY1998. The Senate increase reflected, among other activities, personnel costs, and \$700,000 for expenses of computer and telecommunications functions, which in prior years were funded in the budget of the Sergeant at Arms.

Conferees agreed to a funding level allowing for 1,251 FTEs, as proposed by the Senate. The House proposed an FTE level of 1,247. Presently, the number of authorized FTE positions is 1,247 (596 on the House payroll and 651 on the Senate payroll).

During consideration of its bill on July 20, the Senate adopted an amendment increasing by \$220,000 the appropriation for general expenses of the Capitol Police.

Capitol Visitor Center

Congress approved an emergency supplemental appropriation of \$100 million to the Architect of the Capitol "for planning, engineering, design, and construction" of a Capitol Visitor Center. The funding was added in conference on H.R. 4328, FY1999 Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill (P.L. 105-277). The conference report stipulates that appropriated funds for the project are to be supplemented by private funds. The estimated cost of the Capitol visitors' center is \$125 million.⁵⁶ Construction of the visitors' center, conferees reasoned, would "provide greater security for all persons working in or visiting the United States Capitol and a more convenient place in which to learn of the work of Congress."⁵⁷

The appropriation culminated nearly a decade of discussions over the feasibility of construction of a center. Planning for a center began in 1991, when the Architect of the Capitol received approval to use previously appropriated security enhancement funds for the center's conceptual planning and design.⁵⁸

Hearings on a proposal to construct a visitor center were held by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration early in 1997. During the hearings, the committee chairman expressed concern over congressional encouragement of private funding at the same time that Congress was investigating 1996 campaign fund-raising activities.⁵⁹ On September 24, 1998, the committee held hearings on Capitol complex security, including the role of the proposed visitor center.

Architect of the Capitol Issues

Architect of the Capitol Budget

The House and Senate consider separate budget requests for operations of the Architect of the Capitol (AOC) in direct support of Congress, funded in Title I of the bill. They consider separate requests because the House budget request does not include Senate office building funding (which is determined by the Senate), and the Senate considers the budget request without House

⁵⁶ Source is the Capitol Preservation Commission Advisory Board.

⁵⁷ "Conference Report on H.R. 4328, Making Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1999," *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 144, Oct. 19, 1998, p. 11524.

⁵⁸ U.S. Architect of the Capitol, *United States Capitol Visitor Center: Final Design Report* (Washington: U.S. Architect of the Capitol, Nov. 10, 1995), p. 5. P.L. 101-520, 104 Stat. 2282.

⁵⁹ Statement of Chairman John Warner before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration during oversight hearings on operations of legislative offices, on March 5, 1997.

office building funding (which is determined by the House). The total Title I budget request, including House and Senate office buildings, was \$221.9 million.

Of the \$221.9 million, \$87.5 million was requested for costs of 228 projects identified by the AOC for a 5-year capital improvement program. More than \$34 million of the \$87.5 million request is for projects requested by congressional agencies, for example, the Capitol police and Library of Congress.

Two major expenses in the \$87.5 million request were for the perimeter security project (\$20 million) and for the beginning of repairs to the Capitol dome (\$7.5 million).⁶⁰ Subsequently, in April 1998, both houses approved the funds for the perimeter security project and Capitol dome repairs in H.R. 3579, as part of an FY1998 supplemental appropriations bill. H.R. 3579 was signed into law (P.L. 105-174) May 1, 1998.

As considered by the Senate, the AOC's request was \$178.1 million, which was a 14.5 % increase over the FY1998 appropriation of \$155.5 million. The Senate bill provided \$142.6 million, a decrease of 8.3% from FY1998. This figure did not include appropriations for House Office Buildings of \$42.1 million, as determined by the House. Including House Office Buildings appropriations, the Senate figure would have been \$184.7 million.

Senate report language directed the AOC to complete a master design project plan for the Capitol Police before the Senate provides funds for the design projects requested by the AOC.⁶¹ A total of \$475,000 was made available to the AOC for this purpose. The Senate report further directed that the master plan include consideration of the security needs of the Capitol complex, and the bill provided \$1 million for security designs by the U.S. Capitol Police.

An additional \$750,000 was provided to the AOC for support of the physical security installations of the Capitol Police Board. Language also requires the AOC to report to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the Senate Committee on Appropriations on expenses in support of Capitol police security upgrades.

As considered by the House, the AOC's request was \$166.1 million, an 18.6% increase from FY1998. The House bill recommended \$121.4 million, a decrease of 13.3% from FY1998. The figure did not include appropriations for Senate Office Buildings of \$53.6 million, as determined by the Senate. Including Senate Office Buildings appropriations, the House figure would have been \$175.1 million.

House report language recognized that the AOC had limited funds to deal with a maintenance backlog and directed the AOC to use energy savings and excess proceeds from recycling to help defray costs in eliminating the backlog. In addition, the House report directed the House inspector general to audit the fire-protection systems in House office buildings and the House side of the Capitol, and to report his findings to the House Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on House Oversight.

Conferees agreed to \$184.2 million and to House report language directing the AOC "to develop an energy savings plan that will use proceeds to fund needed maintenance."⁶² Conferees also agreed to increase the appropriation for the Capitol Power Plant by \$4 million for replacement of the East plant chiller.

⁶⁰ Congress appropriated \$1.5 million in FY1998 for a study of repairs to the dome.

⁶¹ Senate report, FY1999, p. 30.

⁶² Conference report, FY1999, p. 36.

Conferees accepted House language appropriating \$1 million to the AOC for the Congressional Cemetery, authorizing the AOC to make a grant of \$1 million to the National Trust for Historic Preservation. This grant is to be matched by private donations to the Association for the Preservation of Historic Congressional Cemetery to provide for the perpetual maintenance of the cemetery.

Congress provided additional funding of \$100 million to the Architect of the Capitol “for planning, engineering, design, and construction of a Capitol visitor center.” The Architect is “directed not to expend any funds for this project without an obligation plan approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations which shall specify the purpose and amount of anticipated obligations.”

Support Agency Funding

Congressional Budget Office Budget

Both the House and Senate versions contained an FY1999 budget of \$25.7 million for the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), a 3.5% increase over the FY1998 budget of \$24.8 million. The proposals were 1.0% less than the FY1999 budget request of \$25.9 million.

Conferees agreed with House report language directing that, effective October 1, 1998, CBO post on the Internet CBO papers and publications that can be made available to the public, along with an index, and language directing House Information Resources and the Library of Congress “to work out an acceptable solution to the computer needs of CBO.”⁶³

House report language also required that CBO provide information to Congress⁶⁴ on CBO revenue estimates (generated by tax law changes and the rate of capital gains tax), assumptions underlying these estimates, explanations of any discrepancies between estimates and revenues, explanations for deviations or more than \$25 billion between the estimated federal deficit or surplus and the actual budget deficit or surplus (for last 5 years), and comparison of first year discretionary outlay estimates and expenditures for accounts in specified budget functions, among other information required. This information was to be submitted by August 30, 1998, or the date the FY1999 Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill conference convenes (which was September 18, 1998), whichever was earlier.

General Accounting Office Budget

Conferees agreed to \$354.3 million for the General Accounting Office (GAO), a 4.4% increase over FY1998. The Senate bill contained \$363.3 million, a 7.0% increase over the FY1998 funding level and a 1.2% decrease from the FY1999 request. The House bill contained \$354.2 million, a 4.3% increase over FY1998 and a 3.7% decrease from the FY1999 request.

Conferees included additional funding for GAO program changes including appropriations for 50 FTEs and inserted language that they expected at least one-third of the program funding increase to be used “to support information technology (IT) work, particularly in support of issues related to the Year 2000 computing crisis.”⁶⁵ Conferees directed that those funds in excess of those

⁶³ Conference report, FY1999, p. 36.

⁶⁴ The report is to be submitted to the Speaker of the House, majority and minority leaders of the House and Senate, chairs and ranking minority members of the House Committee on Ways and Means, House Committee on Appropriations, Senate Committee on Finance, and the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

⁶⁵ Conference report, FY1999, p. 43.

required for the additional FTEs be allocated to program contract support and directed the comptroller general to account on the use of these additional funds, including the number of FTEs and the amount of the increase used to acquire contract services.

The Senate bill contained funding for 3,300 FTEs, including funds for 75 of the 100 additional FTEs requested by GAO. The House bill recommended funds for 3,225 FTEs and stated its intention that GAO consider the use of consultants and other experts to provide the agency with greater flexibility and to avoid an internal, full-time staff increase.

Additional funds were made available to GAO in H.R. 4328, FY1999 Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 105-277) to assist the legislative branch in meeting the Year-2000 compliance. Conferees on the bill agreed to \$5 million to be available for transfer from GAO to “all entities of the legislative branch other than the ‘Senate’ and ‘House of Representatives covered by the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1998.’” Transfers by GAO are subject to approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Library of Congress Budget

The Library of Congress’s budget is included in both titles of the legislative appropriations bill. Title I includes funds for the Congressional Research Service (CRS), while Title II includes funds for the majority of activities of the Library of Congress.

Congressional Research Service

Conferees agreed to \$67.1 million for FY1999. The House bill contained a 3.2% increase, to \$66.7 million from an FY1998 level of \$64.6 million. The Senate bill contained an increase of 5.1%, to \$67.9 million. Conferees agreed to House report language directing “that the Congressional Research Service should replace departing staff with lower level professionals to even out grade distribution” and that CRS “not increase its full-time equivalent (FTE) employment level above the current level.”⁶⁶

Library of Congress, Except CRS

Conferees agreed to \$296.5 million for FY1999. The House proposal for Library operations was \$291.7 million, a 3.3% increase over FY1998. The Senate’s recommendation of \$298.1 million was a 5.6% increase. Conferees agreed to Senate report language concerning FTE staff (see below) and directed that appropriations in the bill be spent within the LOC’s current FTE level.

The House bill funded 4,076 FTEs for all Library positions, including CRS, with other positions financed through reimbursable and gift and trust funds. House report language noted that the bill did not fund new staff positions and directed the Library to fund any new positions through attrition or reprogramming.

The Senate version contained funds for 4,070 FTEs, decreasing the positions from 4,083. The Senate bill contained funds for 8 FTEs in information technology. Senate report language states that the Library “has, and will continue to be, a significant resource for the Congress in addressing the year 2000 conversion.”⁶⁷ An additional 10 FTEs were included for the succession

⁶⁶ Conference report, FY1999, p. 30.

⁶⁷ Senate report, FY1999, p. 40.

plan of CRS, along with 13 FTEs for additional security personnel, primarily to operate X-ray machines and metal detectors at public entrances.

Conferees also agreed to Senate language “urging the Library to continue efforts to assist the Senate with a legislative information retrieval system;”⁶⁸ providing \$2 million to digitize materials from the LOC collections relating to “Meeting the Frontiers - Russia and Alaska;” and designating that \$250,000 be used in the commemoration of the Lewis and Clark expedition in 2003.

Conferees agreed with House report language directing the LOC to determine the extent of its collections security problem. They further directed the LOC to develop a plan to coordinate all aspects of the Library’s interior and exterior physical security by January 15, 1999. The Library is directed to consult with the Architect of the Capitol and to use the Capitol police as a source of information, and to consult with the Capitol police on industry practices. Language in the Senate report encouraged the Library to consult with the Capitol police on external security issues. Conference language regarding appropriations for Library buildings and grounds, funded under the Architect of the Capitol (AOC), directed the AOC to “obtain the concurrence of the Capitol Police Board in the submission of budget requests regarding the physical security of the Library’s buildings and grounds.”⁶⁹

Senate language permanently authorizing the LOC’s American Folklife Center was accepted in conference.

Additional funds were made available to the Capitol Police Board for Capitol complex and Library of Congress security enhancements in H.R. 4328, FY1999 Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 105-277). The conference report on H.R. 4328 contains language “to allow the transfer of funds to either the Architect of the Capitol or the Library of Congress, based upon plans approved by the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.”

Government Printing Office Budget

The Government Printing Office (GPO) is funded in both Title I (for congressional printing and binding) and Title II (for other operations of GPO). For congressional printing and binding, conferees agreed to the House figure of \$74.5 million, an 8.8% decrease over the FY1998 level of \$81.7 million. The \$81.7 million House FY1998 figure includes an \$11 million transfer from the GPO revolving fund. Language in the House report stated that the level of funding recommended was based on savings due to installation of the direct-to-plate technology and an FTE level that is about 100 positions below the present ceiling.⁷⁰

The Senate bill contained \$75.5 million for congressional printing and binding. This was a 6.9% increase over the FY1998 level used in the Senate report of \$70.6 million (which did not include an \$11 million transfer). Conferees agreed to an administrative provision in the House version that authorized up to \$11 million to be transferred from the GPO revolving fund in its FY1998 budget authority.

Conferees also agreed to language in the House report that directed the Clerk of the House, in consultation with the Secretary of the Senate and the public printer, to study the present and

⁶⁸ Conference report, FY1999, p. 39.

⁶⁹ Conference report, FY1999, p. 41.

⁷⁰ House report, FY1999, p. 23.

future printing needs of the House and Senate to ascertain the most cost-effective printing program for House and Senate use. Conferees added language requesting the Secretary of the Senate to work with the Clerk of the House on the project.

Funding for GPO in Title II of the bill is \$29.3 million, the House figure, for activities of the Office of the Superintendent of Documents. The Senate recommended \$29.6 million. Title II also contains funding from time to time for the GPO revolving fund. Conferees agreed to language in Title II directing GPO to complete assessments, plan for their implementation, and complete action necessary to make the agency Year-2000 compliant during FY1999.

Major Funding Trends ⁷¹

Guide to Determining Legislative Budget Trends

Interpretation of budget trends is determined primarily by three factors: (1) selection of current or constant dollars to express budget authority (constant dollars reflecting the impact of inflation); (2) selection of budget authority contained in annual appropriations bills, with or without permanent budget authority (permanent budget authority not requiring annual approval by Congress); and (3) selection of fiscal years to be compared.

Current-dollar data reflect actual budget authority appropriated each year. Constant-dollar data reflect the conversion of actual budget authority into equivalent 1998 dollars. For example, Congress appropriated budget authority of \$41,793,000 for the Senate in FY1968, excluding permanent budget authority. Converted into 1998 dollars, \$41,793,000 is \$196,955,517.

When reviewing the 30-year growth of the Senate budget from FY1968-FY1998 in current dollars, the increase amounts to 1003.0%. In constant dollars, the increase is 134.1%. The constant-dollar figure indicates budget growth after the effects of inflation are neutralized.

Differences also appear based on the choice of fiscal years used to compare budget authority. For example, a comparison of budget growth between FY1968 and FY1998 shows the following changes in *total legislative* budgets after adjustment for inflation: FY1968-FY1998, +83.0%; FY1972-FY1998, +8.7%; and FY1978-FY1998, -12.3%.⁷²

Changes in the 1970s significantly affected Congress's budget. Implementation by Congress of the 1970 Legislative Reorganization Act increased the budgets and staffs of congressional committees and support agencies from FY1971 through FY1978. For example, the increase in total legislative budget authority, adjusted for inflation, from FY1969 (pre-1970 Reorganization Act) through FY1973 (a year of significant implementation of the 1970 Reorganization Act) was 64.5%.

The legislative budget during the 1970s also reflected implementation of the 1974 Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act, which created the House and Senate Budget Committees and the Congressional Budget Office. Significant funding also began for development of House and Senate computer capabilities. This growth in the legislative budget stabilized by FY1978 and has remained fairly level since that time.

⁷¹ The budget authority for FY1998 excludes supplementals and a transfer.

⁷² These figures are based on constant dollars and do not include permanent budget authority, which is not included in the annual legislative branch appropriations bill but, rather, is automatically funded annually.

Current Legislative Budget Trends

Between FY1978 and FY1998, the total legislative budget, when adjusted for inflation, decreased by 12.3%. Budget authority for direct congressional operations in Title I decreased by 6.0% over this time.

Throughout the 12 years following FY1978 (FY1979-FY1990), legislative budget funding remained lower than the FY1978 budget authority, when adjusted for inflation. The first increase over the FY1978 budget occurred in FY1991, a 1.1% increase from the FY1978 level. Funding increased again in FY1992 and FY1995 but decreased in FY1993, FY1994, FY1996, and FY1997. The change between FY1994 and FY1998 was a decrease of 9.4% in total legislative budget authority. Using current dollars, the change between FY1994 and FY1998 was an increase of 0.3%.

Table 2. Legislative Branch Appropriations, FY1994 to FY1998

(budget authority in billions of current dollars)^a

FY1994	FY1995	FY1996	FY1997	FY1998
2.271	2.378	2.184	2.203	2.288

- a. These figures represent current dollars, exclude permanent budget authorities, and reflect supplementals and rescissions. Permanent budget authorities are not included in the annual legislative branch appropriations bill but, rather, are automatically funded annually.

Table 3. Legislative Branch Appropriations, FY1999 In H.R. 4112 (Regular Annual Appropriations, P.L. 105-275) and H.R. 4328 (Emergency Supplemental Appropriations, P.L. 105-277)

(in thousands of current dollars)

Entity	FY1998 Enacted	FY1999 Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conf. on H.R. 4112	Total FY1999 (H.R. 4112 and H.R. 4328)
Title I: Congressional Operations						
Senate	461,055	476,728	— ^f	469,391	469,391	474,891 ^j
House of Representatives	709,008 ^a	765,588	734,108	734,108	734,108	740,481 ^k
Joint Items	86,711	97,695	89,070	93,181	96,134	204,911
Office of Compliance	2,479	2,286	2,086	2,286	2,086	2,086
Congressional Budget Office	24,797	25,938	25,671	25,671	25,671	25,671
Architect of the Capitol, excluding Library Buildings and Grounds	192,156 ^b	221,898	121,434 ^g	184,701	184,186	284,186 ^m
Congressional Research Service, Lib. of Congress	64,603	68,461	66,688	67,877	67,124	67,124
Congressional Printing and Binding, Government Printing Office	81,669 ^c	84,000	74,465	75,500	74,465	74,465
Subtotal, Title I	1,622,478	1,742,594	1,113,522 ^g	1,652,716	1,653,165	1,873,820
Title II: Other Legislative Agencies						
Botanic Garden	3,016	3,235	3,032	3,180	3,052	3,052
Library of Congress, except Congressional Research Service	282,309 ^d	300,871	291,701	298,129	296,516 ⁿ	296,516 ⁿ
Congressional Cemetery and Library Buildings and Grounds, Architect of the Capitol	11,573	16,139	12,933 ^h	12,566	13,672 ^h	13,672 ^h
Government Printing Office, except Congressional Printing and Binding	29,077	36,200 ^e	29,264	29,600	29,264	29,264
General Accounting Office	339,499	367,728	354,238	363,298	354,268	359,268 ^o
Subtotal, Title II	665,474	724,173	691,168	706,773	696,772	701,772
Title IV: Trade Deficit Review Commission						
				1,000		(2,000) ^p
Grand Total	2,287,952	2,466,767	1,804,690ⁱ	2,361,480	2,349,937	2,575,592^p

Sources: Source for columns two through six is Rep. James Walsh, remarks in the House, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 144, Sept. 24, 1998, pp. H8549-H8552. In his remarks, Rep. Walsh inserted a table containing FY1998 and FY1999 request, House bill, Senate bill, and conference figures. The FY1998 figure includes a supplemental in P.L. 105-174, May 1, 1998, and a transfer of \$11 million. Title III contains general provisions and does not contain new budget authority. Source for column seven is the House Appropriations Committee.

- a. Includes an FY1998 supplemental of \$270,300 for payments to widows and heirs of deceased Members.
- b. Includes an FY1998 supplemental of \$7.5 million to begin Capitol dome repairs, and \$20 million for a Capitol perimeter security plan, with \$4 million of the \$20 million transferable to the Capitol Police Board, upon the board's request.
- c. Includes an \$11 million transfer to the Government Printing Office from its revolving fund.
- d. In addition, the Library of Congress had authority in FY1998 to spend \$30.3 million in receipts.
- e. Includes \$6 million for the Government Printing Office revolving fund.
- f. The House column in the *Congressional Record* table on the FY1999 bill does not include \$459.4 million for Senate internal activities.
- g. The House column in the *Congressional Record* table on the FY1999 conference does not include budget authority of \$53.6 million for Senate Office Buildings funded under the Architect of the Capitol.
- h. Includes \$1 million for the congressional cemetery.
- i. The House figures in the *Congressional Record* table on the FY1999 conference do not include budget authorities for internal Senate operations or Senate Office Buildings, funded under the Architect of the Capitol.
- j. Includes \$5.5 million in emergency supplementals under the Sergeant at Arms for completion of Year-2000 computer conversion.
- k. Includes \$6.373 million in emergency supplementals under Chief Administration Officer for completion of Year-2000 computer conversion.
- l. Includes \$106.78 million for emergency supplementals for security enhancements under the Capitol Police Board, General Expenses. The total Joint Items figure also includes \$2 million for the Trade Deficit Review Commission.
- m. Includes \$100 million in emergency supplementals under the Architect of the Capitol, Capitol Buildings, Salaries and Expenses, and for design and construction of a Capitol Visitors' Center.
- n. In FY1999, the Library has authority to spend \$28 million in receipts.
- o. Includes \$5 million in emergency supplementals under Salaries and Expenses for completion of the Year-2000 computer conversion.
- p. Funded under Joint Items for FY1999.
- q. Includes \$223.655 million in emergency supplementals for FY1999.

Table 4. Senate Items, FY1999 In H.R. 4112 (Regular Annual Appropriations, P.L. 105-275) and H.R. 4328 (Emergency Supplemental Appropriations, P.L. 105-277)

(in thousands of current dollars)

Entity	FY1998 Enacted	FY1999 Request	House Bill ^a	Senate Bill	Conf. on H.R. 4112	Total 1999 (H.R. 4112 and H.R. 4328)
Expense						
Allowances/Representation	86	86	—	86	86	86
Salaries, Officers, and Employees	77,254	79,746	—	87,233	87,233	87,233
Office of Legislative Counsel	3,605	3,753	—	3,753	3,753	3,753
Office of Legal Counsel	966	1,004	—	1,004	1,004	1,004
Expense Allowances for Secretary of Senate, et al.	12	12	—	12	12	12
Contingent Expenses						
Inquiries and Investigations	75,600	74,649	—	66,800	66,800	66,800
Senate Intl. Narcotics Control Caucus	370	370	—	370	370	370
Secretary of the Senate ^b	1,511	1,511	—	1,511	1,511	1,511
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper ^c	64,833	63,511	—	60,511	60,511	66,011 ^d
Miscellaneous Items	7,905	7,905	—	8,655	8,655	8,655
Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account	228,600	243,881	—	239,156	239,156	239,156
Stationery (revolving fund)	13	0	—	0	0	0
Official Mail Costs	300	300	—	300	300	300
Subtotal, Contingent Expenses	379,132	392,127	—	377,303	377,303	377,303
Total, Senate	461,055	476,728	—	469,391	469,391	474,891 ^d

Source: Source for columns two through six is Rep. James Walsh, remarks in the House, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 144, Sept. 24, 1998, pp. H8549-H8552. In his remarks, Rep. Walsh inserted a table containing FY1998 and FY1999 request, House bill, Senate bill, and conference figures. Source for column seven is the House Appropriations Committee.

- The Senate does not consider budget authority for internal House operations.
- Office operations of the Secretary of the Senate also are funded under "Salaries, Officers, and Employees."
- Activities of the Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper are also funded under "Salaries, Officers, and Employees."
- Includes emergency supplementals of \$5.5 million for completion of the Year-2000 computer conversion for the Sergeant at Arms.

Table 5. House of Representatives Items, FY1999 In H.R. 4112 (Regular Annual Appropriations, P.L. 105-275) and H.R. 4328 (Emergency Supplemental Appropriations, P.L. 105-277)

(in thousands of current dollars)

Entity	FY1998 Enacted	FY1999 Request	House Bill	Senate Bill ^e	Conf. on H.R. 4112	Total 1999 (H.R. 4112 and H.R. 4328)
Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress	270 ^a	134	136.7	—	137	137
Salaries and Expenses ^b						
House Leadership Offices	12,293	12,689	13,117	—	13,117	13,117
Members' Representational Allowances ^c	379,789	412,964	385,279	—	385,279	385,279
Committee Employees ^d						
Standing Committees, Special and Select (except Appropriations)	86,268	90,608	89,743	—	89,743	89,743
Appropriations Committee	18,276	19,731	19,373	—	19,373	19,373
<i>Subtotal, Committee Employees</i>	<i>104,544</i>	<i>110,339</i>	<i>109,116</i>	<i>—</i>	<i>109,116</i>	<i>109,116</i>
Allowances and Expenses						
Supplies, Materials, Administrative						
Costs and Federal Tort Claims	2,225	2,706	2,575	—	2,575	2,575
Official Mail (Committees, leadership, administrative and legislative offices)	500	500	410	—	410	410
Government Contributions	124,390	132,949	132,832	—	132,832	132,832
Miscellaneous Items	641	651	651	—	651	651
<i>Subtotal, Allowances and Expenses</i>	<i>127,756</i>	<i>136,806</i>	<i>136,468</i>	<i>—</i>	<i>136,468</i>	<i>136,468</i>
Salaries, Officers and Employees	84,356	92,656	89,991	—	89,991	96,364 ^f
Total, House	709,008	765,588	734,108	—	734,107	740,481^f

Sources: Source for columns two through six is Rep. James Walsh, remarks in the House, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 144, Sept. 24, 1998, pp. H8549-H8552. In his remarks, Rep. Walsh inserted a table containing FY1998 and FY1999 request, House bill, Senate bill, and conference figures. Source for column seven is the House Appropriations Committee.

- This figure represents an FY1998 supplemental appropriation (P.L. 105-174).
- The appropriations bill has two House accounts: (1) Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress and (2) Salaries and Expenses. All the entries that follow Salaries and Expenses fall under that House account, Salaries and Expenses.

- c. This appropriation heading was new in the FY1996 bill. The heading represents a consolidation of (1) the former heading Members' Clerk Hire; (2) the former heading Official Mail Costs; and (3) the former subheading Official Expenses of Members, under the heading Allowances and Expenses.
- d. This appropriation heading was new in the FY1996 bill. The heading represents a consolidation of (1) the former heading Committee Employees; (2) the former heading Standing Committees, Special and Select; (3) the former heading Committee on Budget (studies); and (4) the former heading Committee on Appropriations (studies and investigations).
- e. The House does not consider budget authority for internal Senate operations.
- f. Includes \$6.373 million in emergency supplementals for the Chief Administrative Officer for completion of Year-2000 computer conversion.

Table 6. Legislative Branch Budget Authority Funded in Annual Appropriations Bills, FY1994-FY1998

(Does not include permanent budget authority; in thousands of current dollars)

	FY1994	FY1995	FY1996	FY1997	FY1998
Title I: Congressional Operations^a					
Senate	444,365	460,581	426,919	441,208	461,055
House of Representatives ^b	686,452	728,736	670,561	684,098	709,008
Joint Items ^b	78,750	85,489	81,839	88,581	86,711
Office of Compliance	0	0	2,500	2,609	2,479
Office of Technology Assessment	21,315	21,320	6,115	0	0
Congressional Budget Office	22,317	23,001	24,288	24,532	24,797
Arch. of the Capitol, ex. Library Buildings and Grounds	150,223	157,190	142,970	140,674	192,156
Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress	56,718	60,084	60,084	62,641	64,603
Cong. Printing and Binding, Government Printing Office	88,404	84,724	83,770	81,669	81,669
Total, Title I^b	1,548,544	1,621,125	1,499,046	1,526,012	1,622,478
Title II: Other Agencies^a					
Botanic Garden	3,008	3,230	3,053	36,402	3,016
Library of Congress, ex. CRS	249,813	262,866	264,616	269,117	282,309
Library Bldgs. and Grnds., Architect of the Capitol	9,974	12,483	12,428	9,753	11,573
Copyright Royalty Tribunal	128	0	0	0	0
Govt. Print. Off., ex. Congressional Printing and Binding	29,082	31,607	30,307	29,077	29,077
General Accounting Office	430,165	446,743	374,406	332,520	339,499
Total, Title II	722,170	756,929	684,810	676,869	665,474
Grand Total^{b,c}	2,270,714	2,378,054	2,183,856	2,202,881	2,287,952

See notes at end of **Table 7**.

Table 7. Legislative Branch Budget Authority Funded in Annual Appropriations Bills, FY1994-FY1998

(Does not include permanent budget authority; in thousands of constant 1998 dollars)

	FY1994	FY1995	FY1996	FY1997	FY1998
Title I: Congressional Operations^a					
Senate	491,740	495,638	446,238	450,829	461,055
House of Representatives ^b	759,637	784,204	700,905	699,016	709,008
Joint Items ^b	87,146	91,996	85,542	90,513	86,711
Office of Compliance	0	0	2,613	2,666	2,479
Office of Technology Assessment	23,587	22,943	6,392	0	0
Congressional Budget Office	24,696	24,752	25,387	25,067	24,797
Arch. of the Capitol, ex. Library Buildings and Grounds	166,239	169,155	149,440	143,742	192,156
Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress	62,765	64,657	62,803	64,007	64,603
Cong. Printing and Binding, Government Printing Office	97,829	91,173	87,561	83,450	81,669
TOTAL, Title I^b	1,713,638	1,744,518	1,566,880	1,559,290	1,622,478
Title II: Other Agencies^a					
Botanic Garden	3,329	3,476	3,191	37,196	3,016
Library of Congress, ex. CRS	276,446	282,874	276,590	274,986	282,309
Library Bldgs. and Grnds., Architect of the Capitol	11,037	13,433	12,990	9,966	11,573
Copyright Royalty Tribunal	142	0	0	0	0
Govt. Print. Off., ex. Congressional Printing and Binding	32,183	34,013	31,678	29,711	29,077
General Accounting Office	476,026	480,747	391,349	339,771	339,499
Total, Title II	799,163	814,543	715,799	691,629	665,474
Grand Total ^{b,c}	2,512,801	2,559,061	2,282,679	2,250,919	2,287,952

Sources: Budget authorities for FY1994-FY1998 are from the House Appropriations Committee. FY1995 budget authorities reflect rescissions and a supplemental contained in P.L. 104-19, 109 Stat. 219-221, July 27, 1995, FY1995 Supplemental and Rescissions Act (H.R. 1944). FY1996 budget authorities reflect rescissions contained in P.L. 104-28, Sept. 28, 1996, FY1997 Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act (H.R. 3610). FY1998 budget authorities represent supplementals contained in P.L. 105-174, May 1, 1998, and an \$11 million transfer to the Government Printing Office (GPO) from the GPO revolving fund.

Note: FY1994 budget authority reflects rescissions contained in P.L. 103-211, Feb. 12, 1994, FY1994 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (H.R. 3759).

Excludes permanent appropriations are (in current dollars, in thousands): FY1994, \$329,000; FY1995, \$343,000; FY1996, \$302,000; FY1997, \$325,000; and FY1998, \$333,000. Source is the *U.S. Budget*.

Excludes trust funds are (in current dollars, in thousands): FY1994, \$6,000; FY1995, \$16,000; FY1996, \$31,000; FY1997, \$29,000. Source is the *U.S. Budget*.

Formula for conversion to constant dollars is as follows: 1998 Consumer Price Index (CPI) number divided by each year's CPI number multiplied by that year's budget authority. The CPI index numbers used were 148.2 (1994), 152.4 (1995), 156.9 (1996), 160.5 (1997), and 164.0 (1998 est.). These numbers were provided by the Congressional Budget Office.

- a. Prior to FY1978, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act contained numerous titles. Effective in FY1978, Congress restructured the legislative bill so that it would “more adequately reflect actual costs of operating the U.S. Congress than has been true in the past years” (H.Rept. 95-450, FY1978 Legislative Appropriations). As a result, the act was divided into two titles. Title I, Congressional Operations, was established to contain appropriations for the actual operation of Congress. Title II, Related Agencies, was established to contain the budgets for activities not considered as providing direct support to Congress. Periodically, the act has contained additional titles for such purposes as Capitol improvements and special one-time functions, which are not shown as separate entities on these tables. One such example is the initial funding of \$48 million for the newly established Federal Employee Retirement System (FERS) as part of the FY1987 Supplemental Appropriations Act. OMB included this budget authority within the affected individual legislative branch accounts for that year.
- b. FY1996 figures reflect rescissions in the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY1997 (P.L. 104-208, Sept. 28, 1996). Provisions applicable to legislative branch budget authority in P.L. 104-208 appear in *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 142, Sept. 28, 1996, pp. H11778-H11779.
- c. Grand totals reflect computer rounding and as a result may differ slightly from totals obtained by adding Titles I and II in this table.

For Additional Reading

CRS Reports

CRS Report 97-212. *Legislative Branch Appropriations for FY1998*, by Paul Dwyer.

CRS Report 96-201. *Legislative Branch Budget Authority, FY1968-FY1996*, by Paul Dwyer and Lorraine Tong.

CRS Report 97-112. *Legislative Branch Employment, 1960-1997*, by Paul Dwyer and John Pontius.

CRS Report 98-123. Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions for FY1998, coordinated by Larry Nowels.

Selected World Wide Web Sites

House Committee on Appropriations
<http://www.house.gov/appropriations>

Senate Committee on Appropriations
<http://www.senate.gov/~appropriations/>

CRS Appropriations Products Guide
<http://www.loc.gov/crs/products/apppage.html#la>

Congressional Budget Office
<http://www.cbo.gov>

General Accounting Office
<http://www.gao.gov>

Office of Management & Budget
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/EOP/OMB/html/ombhome.html>

Key Policy Staff

Area of Expertise	Name	CRS Division
Appropriations Process	James Saturno	GOV
Appropriations Process	Sandy Streeter	GOV
Committee Funds	Lorraine Tong	GOV
Committee Staff	John Pontius	GOV
Legislative Funds and Operations	Paul Dwyer	GOV
Legislative Funds and Operations	Lorraine Tong	GOV
Legislative Operations and Administration	Mildred Amer	GOV
Legislative Staff, Mail and Operations	John Pontius	GOV

Division abbreviations: GOV = Government.

Author Information

Paul E. Dwyer
Specialist in American National Government

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.